

REMARKS

The following remarks are being submitted as a supplement to the full and complete response filed January 9, 2006 in response to the Office Action dated October 7, 2005. Applicants again thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephone interview with the Applicants' representatives and with the undersigned on December 30, 2005.

In view of the claims as set forth above and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-16 are under consideration in this application.

Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,810,359 to Sakaguchi et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,634 to Borg et al. This rejection has been carefully considered, but is most respectfully traversed.

Among the advantages of the present invention, the structure and operation of the invention allows the owner to better plan and prioritize limited budget resources. For example, the present invention can by its nature be offered to users based on fixed pricing or predictable pricing or purchasing methods, such as those methods used by federal, state or local government agencies, as well as by private entities that maintain large inventories of capital equipment. The invention allows a user to better predict, plan and prioritize the limited funds and other resources that all entities, government or private, now face everyday.

In that regard, Applicants are hereby submitting testimonials from clients and those of skill in the art attesting to the novelty of the invention in the industry and to the commercial success of the invention. Said testimonials are attached.

All in all, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejection raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

March 27, 2006

SPF/JCM